

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALICIA ANTOINETTE JONES,
D'SEAN CORDELL JONES, JONTE DA'VON
JONES, DYLAN JONES, JAWAD MALIK
JONES, and NIA CHANTEEL JONES, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CLOTHILDA JEAN JONES,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MITCHELL McCrackins, CAREY
GREENWAY, NATHANIEL ROBINSON, and
CARLOS DAVIS,

Respondents.

Before: Meter, P.J., and Kelly and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Clothilda Jean Jones appeals as of right from the orders terminating her parental rights to her minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). The conditions that led to adjudication were that respondent did not have suitable housing, had a history of failing to provide the minor children with a consistent and stable place to live, and had a substance abuse problem. Services had been in place before the adjudication for several years and continued almost two years after the adjudication until the termination trial. Although respondent had attended a 45-day outpatient substance abuse treatment program, she did not continue in treatment and did not consistently comply with the random drug screens that were required of her. She had applied for Section 8 housing a year

before the termination trial, but did not follow up on the status of her application and blamed petitioner for failing to adequately assist her with finding appropriate housing. On the date of trial, respondent requested that petitioner provide her with a letter stating that the minor children would be returned to her care so she could access emergency relief funds to use to obtain housing. Respondent also did not cooperate or participate in therapy needed to help one of the minor children with his serious anger problems, even though he was removed from school, and refused to participate in her oldest child's therapy, even though the child had asked respondent to participate. The minor children had been out of her care for almost two years, and respondent would not be able to provide proper care and custody within a reasonable time.

The trial court also did not clearly err in its best interests determination. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although it was shown that there was a bond between respondent and the minor children, it was clear that respondent could not provide the minor children with a consistent, stable environment for them to live, thrive, and grow. She had been provided with many services, did not comply with or follow through with the services, and blamed others for her inability to adequately care for the minor children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood